IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.P.BALACHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 3RD DECEMBER 2007 / 12TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

WP(C).No. 34897 of 2007(D)

PETITIONER:

SHAJI V.JOHN, MANAGING DIRECTOR,
MAIECO CONSTRUCTIONS PVT.LTD., CHENGANNUR,
RESIDING AT MANNIL LOVEDALE HOUSE,
ANGADICKAL MURI, CHENGANNUR VILLAGE.

BY ADV. SRI.P.HARIDAS

RESPONDENTS:

1. SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
PATHANAMTHITTA.

2. DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
CHENGANNUR.

3. CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, CHENGANNUR.

4. SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE, CHENGANNUR.

5. K.A.VISWAMBHARAN, BHAGAWAT HOUSE,
PERINGALA P.O., CHENGANNUR.

BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.P.A.SALIM

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 03/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX IN WPC 34897/2007

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT. P1 TRUE COPY OF THE LAWYER NOTICE DT. 26.10.07 ISSUED ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER TO THE 5TH RESPONDENT

EXT. P2 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DT. 2.11.07 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO RESPONDENTS 2 & 3

EXT. P3 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DT. 21.11.07 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT

/TRUE COPY/

K.Balakrishnan Nair &
K.P.Balachandran, JJ.

W.P.(C)No. 34897 of 2007 D

JUDGMENT

Balakrishnan Nair, J.

The petitioner is a civil construction contractor, who did certain works for the fifth respondent. According to the petitioner, some more amount is due to him from the said respondent for the said works. So, he caused to issue a lawyer notice. Thereupon, the fifth respondent started threatening him and his lawyer, it is submitted. In that background, he moved the police seeking protection to his life by filing Exhibits P2 and P3 representations. Thereafter, this writ petition is filed seeking protection to his life from the alleged threat of the fifth respondent.

2. The learned counsel for the fifth respondent denied all the allegations against him. It is submitted on his behalf that he has no intention whatsoever to physically harass the

petitioner or his lawyer. The claim for money made by the petitioner is denied by the said respondent. The learned Government Pleader, upon instructions, submits that both the parties were called to the police station and they were strictly warned not to create any problem.

3. In view of the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the fifth respondent and the learned Government Pleader, we feel that the grievance of the petitioner is redressed. If there is any threat of violence against the person of the petitioner, he can inform the police. In that event, the police shall promptly look into the same and take appropriate action.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

(K.Balakrishnan Nair, Judge)

3rd December, 2007

(K.P.Balachandran, Judge)

tkv